

**PHYSICAL THERAPY BOARD OF CALIFORNIA**

1418 HOWE AVENUE, SUITE 16, SACRAMENTO, CA 95825-3204

TELEPHONE (916) 561-8200 FAX (916) 263-2560

INTERNET <http://www.ptb.ca.gov>**APPROVED MEETING MINUTES
PHYSICAL THERAPY BOARD OF CALIFORNIA
CONTINUING COMPETENCY TASK FORCE**

January 26, 2007

Department of Consumer Affairs Complex
Structural Pest Control Board Conference Room, Suite 14
Sacramento, California

*Friday, January 26, 2007 10:00 a.m.***1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

Marty Jewell, PT – Chairperson
Debra Alviso, PT
Don Chu, PT
Rick Katz, PT
Adele Levine
Brad Stockert, PT
Luis Williams, PTA

The meeting was called to order at 10:08 a.m. All members were present except Debra Alviso, Don Chu, Adele Levine and Luis Williams. Ms. Alviso joined the task force meeting at 1:00 p.m.

2. Introduction of Continuing Competency Task Force Members

Ms. Jewell asked everyone in attendance to introduce themselves.

3. The Continuing Competency Task Force will discuss its charge of proposing regulations to ensure continuing competency of physical therapists and physical therapist assistants by developing criteria to implement the law regarding 1) continuing education and 2) continuing competency.

Ms. Jewell invited Steve Hartzell, Executive Officer to make opening remarks regarding the regulatory process and his thoughts on what considerations should be given by the members of the task force.

Anita Scuri, legal counsel for the board took a moment to inform the members that as a task force of the board, with more than two members, they were subject to the laws mandated by the Bagley-Keene Open Meetings Act. Additionally, she provided the members with a handout for them to refer to regarding the open meeting laws. Ms.

CONTINUING COMPETENCY TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

January 26, 2007

Scuri also took the opportunity to educate the members on the rulemaking process governed by the Administrative Procedures Act.

Mr. Hartzell then began by explaining that he envisioned the initial meeting of the task force to be for brainstorming to develop a path exploring all thoughts regarding content, approval, audits, etc. He also suggested that the end result would be two regulatory packages. The first package would address continuing education and the second addressing continuing competency. He further recommended that the draft regulatory language addressing continuing education be presented to the board for their consideration at the May, 2007 meeting.

Ms. Jewell expressed her desire to prevent recreating “the wheel” and to investigate other California state board’s requirements as well as physical therapy board requirements of neighboring states. Some task force members had already completed this task and shared their findings. Ms. Scuri also interjected her knowledge of the requirements of the Board of Registered Nursing and the Board of Accountancy. A gentleman from the audience requested that the requirements of the Board of Occupational Therapy be considered as well. Ms. Scuri agreed to forward copies of continuing education criteria from other healing arts board, bureaus and committees.

After a lengthy discussion the task force began documenting thoughts as they arose, the thoughts were then categorized as follows:

1) Content Criteria (Acceptable/Unacceptable)

- Academic courses
- Continuing education courses (face to face)
- Home study (internet, packets)
- Conference attendance
- Course instructor/presenter
- Publication
- Specialty certification
- Residency and fellowship programs
- In-services
- Study groups
- Clinical instructor
- CPR/first-aid

2) Provider Expectations

- Faculty qualifications
- Record retention
- Evaluation mechanisms
- Evidence based content
- Course objectives
- Faculty/student ratios and labs
- Product endorsement
- Target Audience

CONTINUING COMPETENCY TASK FORCE

MEETING MINUTES

January 26, 2007

- 2) Provider Expectations (continued)
 - Self review/evaluation process
 - Advertising
- 3) Implementation Process
 - Time frame
 - Documentation
 - Definition of hours
 - Number of hours
 - Waiver process
 - Inactive license
 - Should the Board approve course providers
- 4) Enforcement Mechanisms
 - Tracking/Audit/Approval
 - Consequence of non compliance
 - Disqualification of providers and courses
 - Authority for non compliant providers/courses
 - Due Process

The task force then divided tasks amongst members as follows: Provider expectations were assigned to Marty; delivery methods (in-state) assigned to Debra, (out-of-state) assigned to Rick; content criteria (acceptable vs. unacceptable) assigned to Brad, Don and Luis. Brad agreed to contact Don and Luis to apprise them of the assignment details. The members will return their findings to board staff for dissemination to other members.

The task force decided to schedule the next meeting from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on either April 16th or 18th depending on the availability of the task force members that were not in attendance.

4. Adjournment

The task force adjourned at 2:20 p.m.